

## **REMARKS**

Although the Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment indicated that only the corrected section of the Amendment needed to be re-filed, Applicants have, for the Office's convenience, below included the complete text of the Remarks filed March 24, 2009.

The Examiner is thanked for the performance of a thorough search. By this response, Claims 1–4, 15, and 26 are amended. No claims are added or canceled. Hence, Claims 1–61 are pending in this application, of which Claims 37–54 are withdrawn.

All issues raised in the Office Action mailed January 7, 2009 are addressed hereinafter.

### **I. ALLOWABILITY OF CLAIMS 1–14, 15 AND 26**

The Examiner is thanked for indicating that Claims 1–14, 15, and 26 would be allowable if rewritten or amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph. As explained below, Claims 1–14, 15, and 26 are hereby amended to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2<sup>nd</sup> paragraph rejection. Applicants therefore submit that the claims are in condition for allowance.

### **II. CLAIM REJECTIONS BASED ON 35 U.S.C. § 112**

Claims 1-36 and 55-61 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as allegedly indefinite. The rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Office Action alleges two different areas of indefiniteness. First, the Office Action alleges that it is not clear in Claims 1–4, 15, and 26, by or at which device or component the various recited steps are performed. Applicants disagree with the basis of the rejection. Nonetheless, in the interest of expediting prosecution, Applicants hereby amend the claims as follows:

- With respect to the method Claims 1 and 4, each step is presently recited as being performed by “a client.”

- With respect to computer-readable storage Claims 2 and 15, the claims now explicitly recite that the medium causes “one or more processors at a client” to perform the various recited steps.
- With respect to apparatus Claims 3 and 26, the claims now explicitly recite that the instructions cause “one or more processors at the apparatus” to perform the various recited steps.

Applicants respectfully submit that it is sufficiently clear in the present claims which device or component is performing the recited steps.

Second, the Office Action alleges that, for the feature: “based on the data indicating the plurality of functional areas supported by the router, determining which user interface objects to generate and display,” it does not seem clear how the user interface objects are determined based on the data indicating the plurality of functional areas. Applicants disagree. However, in the interest of expediting prosecution, the claims are presently amended to recite (or depend from claims that recite) the following feature (or a variation thereof):

wherein determining which user interface objects to generate and display comprises identifying user interface objects (a) that correspond to the plurality of functional areas supported by the router; and (b) for which the client and the router have compatible application program interfaces

Applicants respectfully submit that it is sufficiently clear in the present claims how the user interface objects are determined based on the data indicating the plurality of functional areas.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the present claims particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicants regard as their inventions. Applicants respectfully request removal of the rejection.

### III. AMENDED SUBJECT MATTER

Both of the above amendments are clearly supported by the Specification as originally filed. Moreover, since the Office Action has already indicated its assumption that the previous

claims were directed exactly towards the amended subject matter, the amendments introduce no new subject matter that would necessitate a new search.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, all of the pending claims are now in condition for allowance. The Examiner is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned by telephone relating to any issue that would advance examination of the present application.

A petition for extension of time, to the extent necessary to make this reply timely filed, is hereby made. If any applicable fee is missing or insufficient, throughout the pendency of this application, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to any applicable fees and to credit any overpayments to our Deposit Account No. 50-1302.

Respectfully submitted,  
HICKMAN PALERMO TRUONG & BECKER LLP

Date: April 16, 2009

/KarlTRees#58983/  
Karl T. Rees, Reg. No. 58,983

2055 Gateway Place, Suite 550  
San Jose, CA 95110  
(408) 414-1233  
Facsimile: (408) 414-1076